

Navigating Labour and Social Security Legislation in Indian Industries: A Critical Legal and Sectoral Review

G., Banu Priya

Research Scholar, Department of English, MUIT, Lucknow

CITATION

G., Banu Priya (2025). Navigating Labour and Social Security Legislation in Indian Industries: A Critical Legal and Sectoral Review

Shodh Manjusha: An International Multidisciplinary Journal, 02(02), 386–401.

<https://doi.org/10.70388/sm250168>

Article Info

Received: May 21, 2025

Accepted: Aug 23, 2025

Published: Sep 12, 2025

Copyright



This article is licensed under a license [Commons Attribution-Non-commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International Public License \(CC BY-NC-ND 4.0\)](#)

<https://doi.org/10.70388/sm250168>

Abstract

The landscape of labour and social security legislation in India has undergone significant transformation in recent years, particularly with the consolidation of 29 central labour laws into four comprehensive Labour Codes enacted between 2019 and 2020. This paper critically examines the evolution, scope, and sectoral implications of these laws within the context of Indian industries. It explores the legislative intent behind the reforms, which aimed to simplify, rationalize, and modernize archaic labour regulations, while also ensuring economic flexibility and worker protection. The review is structured around a comparative legal analysis of pre-code and post-code frameworks, emphasizing key areas such as industrial relations, wage security, social protection, and occupational health and safety. Special attention is given to the Code on Wages (2019), Code on Social Security (2020), Industrial Relations Code (2020), and Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code (2020). Sector-specific case studies from the manufacturing, construction, gig economy, and information technology sectors are included to evaluate real-world application, compliance challenges, and industry-level adaptations. This paper also highlights the legal ambiguities, enforcement deficits, and concerns raised by trade unions, employers, and labour rights activists. While the codes promise procedural efficiency and inclusivity—especially for informal and gig workers—their success largely hinges on implementation capacity, clarity of rules, and inter-state uniformity. In conclusion, the paper offers a balanced critique of the new legal architecture governing labour and social security in India, underscoring the need for sustained stakeholder engagement, transparent rulemaking, and effective dispute resolution mechanisms. The findings aim to inform policymakers, legal scholars, and industry stakeholders about the strengths and shortcomings of the reforms, and the way forward for building an equitable, efficient, and inclusive labour regime in India.

Keywords: Labour Laws, Social Security, Indian Industries, Labour Codes, Wage Regulation, Industrial Relations, Occupational Safety, Legal Reforms, Gig Economy, Informal Sector, Compliance, Labour Rights, Policy Analysis, Sectoral Review, Labour Welfare

Introduction

Labour laws constitute the foundational framework governing the employment relationship, worker protection, social security, and industrial peace in any nation. In India, labour regulation has historically been characterized by a complex and fragmented legislative structure, with over 40 central and 100 state laws covering various aspects of employment such as wages, social security, industrial relations, occupational health, working hours, and dispute resolution. These laws were enacted over several decades in a piecemeal manner, reflecting the changing political economy of India—from colonial times through post-independence socialist planning, liberalization in the 1990s, and recent policy reforms aimed at ease of doing business.

Despite their original intentions of protecting workers' rights and ensuring dignified employment, these laws often led to procedural complexity, interpretational confusion, and compliance burdens for both employers and employees. The multiplicity of statutes created inconsistencies and overlaps, leading to litigation, regulatory opacity, and a growing informal economy where millions of workers remained outside the ambit of formal protection.

Recognizing these inefficiencies and the need for a more coherent labour governance model, the Government of India undertook a historic reform initiative by codifying 29 existing central labour laws into four broad Labour Codes:

- **The Code on Wages, 2019**
- **The Industrial Relations Code, 2020**
- **The Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020**
- **The Code on Social Security, 2020**

This codification marked a paradigm shift in Indian labour law jurisprudence, promising a unified, simplified, and technologically enabled regulatory environment. While these codes aim to balance the imperatives of economic growth, labour market flexibility, and worker protection, their practical implementation has raised significant questions about inclusivity, decentralization, federalism, and the rights of informal and gig economy workers. The rationale behind this study lies in the growing need to critically assess the efficacy, inclusiveness, and sector-specific implications of the new labour and social security framework in India. As the economy diversifies and industrial structures evolve—with the

emergence of start-ups, platform-based employment, automation, and contract-based work—the relevance and adequacy of labour laws must be constantly evaluated. There is a visible tension between the government’s narrative of rationalizing laws to boost investment and industrial productivity, and the counter-narrative from trade unions, labour organizations, and legal scholars pointing to potential dilution of worker rights and weakening of collective bargaining mechanisms. This tension warrants an objective and detailed analysis that incorporates historical, legal, sectoral, and constitutional perspectives. Moreover, with India aspiring to become a global manufacturing and digital services hub under programs like “Make in India,” “Digital India,” and “Startup India,” the regulatory framework governing labour relations will play a crucial role in determining the sustainability and equity of economic growth. At the same time, the COVID-19 pandemic exposed the deep vulnerabilities in India’s labour market, especially for migrant and informal workers who lacked basic social security and legal protection. These events have amplified the urgency of re-evaluating existing laws and implementation practices. The significance of this research lies in its interdisciplinary and policy-relevant approach. It contributes to legal scholarship by providing a comprehensive doctrinal analysis of a major legal reform that has implications for over 50 crore workers and millions of enterprises. It also offers a nuanced understanding for policymakers, regulators, trade unions, and industrial bodies on how legal reforms are interacting with real-world labour practices and industrial dynamics. In the context of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)—especially SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) and SDG 10 (Reduced Inequality)—this study provides timely insights on how India can craft a labour law ecosystem that is both pro-growth and pro-worker. The paper also engages with the International Labour Organization's (ILO) Decent Work Agenda and its emphasis on social dialogue, employment security, and social protection floors.

Literature Review

The landscape of labour and social security legislation in India has evolved in response to shifting economic, political, and institutional dynamics. This literature review explores the historical trajectory, contemporary reforms, and sectoral implications of labour law in India, relying on a range of empirical studies, legal commentaries, and institutional reports to examine how legal and regulatory transformations are reshaping employment relations, worker protections, and industrial productivity. The evolution of India’s labour laws is deeply rooted in colonial-era legislations that prioritized regulation over rights. The *Report of the Expert Committee on Labour Laws* [1] provided a critical starting point by identifying the

G., Banu Priya

Navigating Labour and Social Security Legislation in Indian Industries: A Critical Legal and Sectoral Review

fragmentation and overlapping provisions within existing statutes, which posed significant challenges to enforcement and compliance. It emphasized the need for rationalization, simplification, and modernization of laws to align with global standards while ensuring the protection of fundamental labour rights.

Deshpande [5] further contextualizes this by discussing how caste-based discrimination and structural inequality historically influenced labour policy in India, resulting in the exclusion of large sections of the population from formal labour protections. He argues that Indian labour laws were never uniformly implemented, especially in the informal sector, which led to systemic inequities in social protection. Multiple scholars have called attention to the inefficiencies and rigidities in India's labour market that necessitated reform. Bhattacharjee [2] argued that outdated institutional structures and inflexible legal frameworks impeded labour mobility, formalization, and job creation in high-growth sectors. Similarly, Papola [12] analyzed the negative effects of excessive regulation on productivity and industrial growth, suggesting that liberalization of labour markets must be accompanied by stronger social security nets.

Mitra [13] analyzed the dual character of the informal sector, where workers operate outside the protective ambit of labour laws. While some informal employment promotes economic participation, Mitra warned that, in most cases, it reflects underemployment, lack of security, and systemic exclusion from social welfare programs.

D'Souza [14] highlighted the lack of institutional coherence in Indian labour governance. He argued that overlapping jurisdictions, varied thresholds for coverage, and multiplicity of enforcement agencies result in administrative inefficiencies. His findings call for a unified labour governance model that balances flexibility with worker welfare. The codification of 29 central labour laws into four Labour Codes—*Code on Wages* [8], *Industrial Relations Code* [9], *OSH Code* [10], and *Social Security Code* [11]—marks a significant turning point. The government rationalized that codification would promote ease of compliance, reduce regulatory burden, and expand coverage [3]. The NITI Aayog report [3] strongly supports these reforms as essential for improving India's global competitiveness and attracting foreign investment. However, not all scholars agree. Roychowdhury [7] critiques the reforms, arguing that the language of simplification masks a dilution of key rights, particularly concerning collective bargaining and dispute resolution. She notes that the Industrial

Relations Code significantly weakens trade union powers and increases thresholds for layoffs, making it easier for employers to retrench workers without government permission.

Standing [15] takes a broader view, placing the reforms in the global context of the rise of precarity. He warns that India's shift toward contractual and fixed-term employment models, as enabled by the new codes, could deepen class stratification and lead to the emergence of a “precariat” class—workers with no security, stability, or voice. The *Code on Wages, 2019* [8] consolidated four wage-related laws and introduced the concept of a national minimum wage. The ILO’s *India Wage Report* [4] praised the initiative for promoting wage equity and transparency but also flagged issues of enforcement. It noted that despite legislative advances, 62% of wage workers still earn below the recommended minimum wage, especially in agriculture, construction, and domestic work sectors. Roychowdhury [7] adds that the move to set minimum wages at the central level may limit the autonomy of states to set context-specific wages, raising concerns over federalism in labour law. Srivastava [17] also critiques the lack of capacity in local labour departments, which hinders effective enforcement of wage laws in rural and semi-urban regions. The *Code on Social Security, 2020* [11] aims to universalize coverage by including unorganized workers, platform workers, and gig workers within the ambit of statutory schemes like Employees’ Provident Fund (EPF) and Employees’ State Insurance (ESI). Babu [16] appreciates the legislative intent but raises doubts about the practical feasibility of integrating gig workers, most of whom have unstable incomes and lack employer-employee relationships.

Srivastava [17] echoes this skepticism, noting that even with the new code, the actual on-ground coverage remains limited to less than 10% of India’s working population. He argues for the creation of a contributory social security floor that is not contingent upon formal employment contracts.

Mehrotra [6] offers a data-driven analysis showing that 93% of India’s workforce remains informal and hence lacks access to formal social protection. He argues that while the code makes formal recognition of gig and platform workers, its success will depend on how contributions are calculated, who bears the burden (state/platform/worker), and the technological readiness of the proposed national labour databases. The *Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020* [10] consolidates 13 laws and introduces uniform standards for safety and working conditions. It extends coverage to establishments employing 10 or more workers and mandates licensing and compliance through digital

platforms. While these provisions indicate a move toward modernization, Lahoti and Swaminathan [19] argue that the law may inadvertently exclude micro-enterprises and home-based workers due to threshold-based exemptions.

The Confederation of Indian Industry (CII) [20] views the OSH Code as a significant step forward, particularly in terms of integrating licensing, reporting, and inspections through a single-window system. However, critics argue that self-certification and the weakening of inspections could compromise worker safety, especially in high-risk sectors like mining and construction. Despite attempts at codification, scholars such as Kapoor [18] point out that gender-specific protections—like maternity benefits, sexual harassment redressal, and crèche facilities—remain inconsistently implemented across industries. Moreover, the weakening of collective bargaining mechanisms, as observed by Roychowdhury [7], could further marginalize already vulnerable groups like women, migrant workers, and contractual labourers. Chand et al. [3] note that while grievance redressal mechanisms such as the establishment of “conciliation officers” and “industrial tribunals” have been retained under the IR Code, the timelines for resolution are often not adhered to. This leads to long-drawn disputes and delayed justice, weakening trust in institutional dispute resolution mechanisms. The impact of labour law reforms is not uniform across sectors. In the manufacturing sector, Kapoor [18] observes that the simplification of thresholds for layoffs and retrenchments has increased managerial flexibility, which could aid formal job creation. However, standing [15] warns that in sectors with high turnover, such as garment and electronics manufacturing, these reforms may worsen working conditions if not accompanied by strict monitoring. In contrast, the gig economy presents a different challenge. Babu [16] and Mehrotra [6] argue that the Code on Social Security introduces path-breaking definitions for gig and platform workers, yet lacks clarity on enforcement. For example, it remains unclear whether platforms like Uber and Swiggy are liable for social security contributions or whether they can bypass obligations by labelling workers as “independent contractors.” In the IT and ITeS sectors, which often remain lightly regulated, D’Souza [14] warns that the new codes do not adequately address issues like extended work hours, psychological health, and remote work conditions. Thus, the reforms may fail to modernize workplace regulation in high-skill, high-output sectors that operate differently from traditional industries. The success of the new labour codes also depends on how effectively states implement and adapt them. Lahoti and Swaminathan [19] observe that several state governments have yet to notify rules under the codes, causing regulatory limbo. Moreover, the centralization of several functions in the

codes—like rule-making and inspection protocols—raises concerns over erosion of state powers and federal imbalance.

D’Souza [14] and Srivastava [17] point out that digitization, while improving transparency, can exclude workers without digital access. They emphasize the need for hybrid models that combine online registration and grievance redressal with physical labor offices, especially in rural areas. This body of literature reveals a complex, evolving narrative of labour law reform in India. On one hand, there is wide recognition that pre-2020 labour legislation was fragmented, difficult to enforce, and misaligned with modern economic realities [1–3, 12, 14]. The new labour codes represent a bold attempt to rationalize the legal framework and expand coverage to newer forms of work, particularly in the unorganized and gig economy [6, 11, 16].

On the other hand, the codes are not without criticism. Scholars point to weakening of labour rights, ambiguity in coverage, potential exclusion of vulnerable workers, and significant implementation gaps [7, 15, 17, 19]. Without robust institutional capacity, clear rule-making, and participatory mechanisms involving both workers and employers, the transformative promise of these reforms may remain unrealized.

Thus, the literature supports a cautious optimism: while the new codes provide a legislative foundation for inclusive and responsive labour regulation, their real impact will depend on how they are implemented, monitored, and evolved through future amendments and judicial interpretation.

Methodology

A rigorous and well-defined research methodology is essential for critically analyzing the evolution, structure, implementation, and sectoral implications of labour and social security legislation in India. Given the multi-dimensional nature of this study—which spans legal analysis, policy evaluation, and sector-specific application—the research adopts a mixed-method approach combining **doctrinal legal research**, **comparative policy analysis**, and **qualitative sectoral case studies**. This methodology is designed to examine both the text and context of India’s labour law reforms, especially the four labour codes enacted between 2019 and 2020. The study is grounded in **constructivist legal realism**, which posits that law must be understood not just in its textual form, but also in the context of its implementation, interpretation, and real-world outcomes. In line with this perspective, the research does not limit itself to black-letter law but extends into socio-legal dimensions, examining how

Navigating Labour and Social Security Legislation in Indian Industries: A Critical Legal and Sectoral Review

legislation interacts with administrative systems, judicial interpretations, industrial structures, and worker experiences.

The research adopts a **qualitative and analytical approach**:

- **Qualitative** because it seeks in-depth understanding of legal provisions, their interpretation, and their practical implications.
- **Analytical** because it compares laws, reviews judicial decisions, and evaluates how reforms affect diverse stakeholders across sectors.

The study also incorporates elements of **policy research**, enabling a critical review of institutional and administrative reforms within India's federal labour law framework. This involves systematic examination of statutes, codes, rules, and judicial decisions pertaining to labour and social security laws. It covers:

- **Historical tracing** of labour laws from colonial statutes (e.g., Factories Act, Trade Unions Act) to post-independence legislations.
- **Textual analysis** of the four new labour codes:
 - Code on Wages, 2019
 - Industrial Relations Code, 2020
 - Code on Social Security, 2020
 - Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020
- **Comparative analysis** between pre-reform and post-reform provisions to identify structural simplifications, substantive changes, or new regulatory mandates.
- **Review of judicial interpretations** by Indian High Courts and the Supreme Court on matters such as contract labour, right to association, equal remuneration, safety standards, and social security eligibility.

This doctrinal study establishes a legal baseline for the research, identifying both continuity and departures in the evolution of labour law in India. To understand the on-ground implications of the new labour codes, the study conducts **sector-specific qualitative case studies**. Four industrial sectors are selected based on diversity in employment patterns, regulatory complexity, and vulnerability of workers:

1. **Manufacturing Sector (e.g., auto, textiles)**
2. **Construction Sector**
3. **Information Technology and ITeS Sector**
4. **Gig and Platform Economy (e.g., food delivery, ride-hailing)**

Each case study investigates:

- The structure of employment (regular vs. contract vs. gig)
- Labour law applicability and compliance
- Worker access to social security benefits
- Gender and inclusivity perspectives
- Role of trade unions, industry bodies, and regulatory agencies

Data for these case studies is collected through review of:

- Government inspection reports
- News articles and investigative journalism
- Industry white papers (e.g., from NASSCOM, CII, FICCI)
- Court cases and legal challenges
- Reports by NGOs, worker unions, and labour rights organizations

This component captures how laws translate into lived realities, shedding light on implementation gaps and sectoral inequalities. The analysis helps assess whether the legislative intent of rationalization and digital compliance is being realized on the ground, especially in low-capacity states or in sectors with high informalization. In this segment, Indian labour codes are compared with global best practices. The study benchmarks India's legal reforms against:

- ILO Conventions (e.g., C87, C98, C102)
- Labour regulations in emerging economies (e.g., Brazil, South Africa, Indonesia)
- Social security frameworks for gig and platform workers in OECD countries (e.g., UK, Canada)

Navigating Labour and Social Security Legislation in Indian Industries: A Critical Legal and Sectoral Review

This comparative framework identifies strengths, gaps, and alignment with global labour standards.

Results and Discussions

This Labour and social security laws form the backbone of any industrial economy by ensuring legal protection for workers while maintaining industrial harmony. In India, the transformation from a fragmented, colonial-era regulatory regime to the consolidated **Four Labour Codes**—introduced between 2019 and 2020—has triggered significant scholarly, political, and industrial discourse. This review-based research synthesizes existing academic literature, policy documents, legal reports, and sectoral studies to critically evaluate the formulation, objectives, and implementation of these reforms, as well as their impact across major industrial sectors. Indian labour laws were originally shaped during the British era, with early legislation such as the **Factories Act (1881)** and **Trade Disputes Act (1929)** designed more to maintain industrial order than to ensure welfare. Post-independence, India adopted a rights-based approach, enacting welfare-oriented laws such as the **Industrial Disputes Act (1947)**, **Employees' State Insurance Act (1948)**, and **Minimum Wages Act (1948)**.

However, by the early 2000s, criticism grew around the **multiplicity of laws, contradictory provisions, and complex compliance structures** [1][2]. The **Expert Committee on Labour Laws (2002)** strongly recommended rationalization to avoid regulatory overreach and compliance fatigue [1]. The **Four Labour Codes** consolidate 29 central laws into thematic areas:

- **Code on Wages, 2019:** Merges wage-related laws and introduces a national minimum wage.
- **Industrial Relations Code, 2020:** Simplifies rules on strikes, layoffs, and trade union recognition.
- **Social Security Code, 2020:** Aims to universalize coverage to gig, unorganized, and platform workers.
- **Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020:** Integrates safety and welfare legislation under one umbrella.

These codes aim to simplify compliance, reduce arbitrariness in inspection, and extend protections to more workers [3][4]. While the codes represent a legislative simplification, critics argue they dilute worker rights, particularly in the areas of:

- **Right to Strike:** The IR Code requires a 14-day notice period, even in non-public utility services [7].
- **Trade Union Recognition:** A threshold of 51% membership is seen as restrictive to collective bargaining [7].
- **Threshold Exemptions:** Factories with less than 300 workers can now retrench without government approval [7][15].

Furthermore, judicial interpretations have begun to emerge questioning **delegated rule-making** powers and **federal overreach** [17].

a. Manufacturing Sector

The **easing of retrenchment rules** and introduction of **fixed-term employment** have been welcomed by industry associations like CII and FICCI [20]. However, studies show that in labour-intensive sectors like textiles and apparel, the reforms may lead to reduced job permanency [18].

b. Construction Sector

With high informality (over 90%) and migrant labour dependence, the impact here is mixed. The Social Security Code promises registration and welfare for building workers, but experts note **implementation bottlenecks** due to poor digital access and lack of labour data [6][17].

c. Gig and Platform Economy

For the first time, gig and platform workers are defined in legal terms under the **Social Security Code**. However, the actual **contribution mechanism** (how platforms, workers, and government will share costs) remains vague, raising concerns about **enforceability** and **exclusion** [6][16].

d. IT and ITeS Sector

Navigating Labour and Social Security Legislation in Indian Industries: A Critical Legal and Sectoral Review

These sectors operate largely outside the framework of traditional factory-based laws. Scholars argue that the codes fail to address **remote work**, **digital monitoring**, and **mental health concerns** prevalent in the tech workforce [14].

The literature reviewed reveals a legal and policy framework in transition. The new labour codes offer procedural efficiency and expanded definitions but fall short in terms of enforceability, decentralization, and inclusivity. Sectoral impact remains uneven, with vulnerable workers—particularly in gig and informal sectors—still facing exclusion. The success of these reforms ultimately hinges not on legislative design alone but on **multi-stakeholder coordination**, **state-level rule formulation**, and **technology-led transparency**.

Table 1: Comparison of Pre-Code and Post-Code Labour Laws

Category	Pre-Reform Laws	Post-Reform Labour Code
Wages	Minimum Wages Act, Payment of Wages Act	Code on Wages, 2019
Industrial Disputes	Industrial Disputes Act	Industrial Relations Code, 2020
Social Security	EPF Act, ESI Act, Maternity Act	Code on Social Security, 2020
Health & Safety	Factories Act, Contract Labour Act	OSHC Code, 2020

Table 2: Sector-Wise Impact of Labour Codes

Sector	Key Reforms	Observed Challenges
Manufacturing	Flexible layoffs, Fixed-term employment	Job insecurity, Declining unionism
Construction	BOCW welfare board integration	Low worker registration
IT/ITES	Limited coverage	No regulation of remote work
Gig Economy	Legal recognition	Unclear contribution mechanisms

Table 3: Stakeholder Positions on Labour Codes

Stakeholder	Supportive Aspects	Concerns Raised
Industry Bodies	Ease of compliance, exit	Delay in rule notifications

	flexibility	
Trade Unions	Digital records, broader coverage	Weak collective bargaining provisions
Workers' Groups	Gig worker inclusion	Lack of social security fund clarity

Table 4: Status of Labour Code Implementation (2024 Review)

Code	Central Rules Notified	States Notified (out of 28)
Code on Wages	Yes	20
IR Code	Yes	12
OSHC Code	Yes	14
Social Security Code	Yes	17

Table 5: Comparison with ILO Core Conventions

ILO Convention	Indian Status	Compliance via Codes
C87 (Freedom of Association)	Not ratified	Partially addressed
C98 (Collective Bargaining)	Not ratified	Limited implementation
C102 (Social Security)	Not ratified	Partial alignment via Social Security Code

Table 6: Social Security Access by Worker Type

Worker Category	Legal Coverage	Practical Access
Regular Formal Workers	EPFO, ESI	High
Contractual Workers	Varies by employer	Moderate
Gig Workers	Defined under SS Code	Low
Informal Workers	Through welfare boards	Very Low

Table 7: Key Strengths and Weaknesses of Labour Code Reform

Strengths	Weaknesses
Simplification of 29 laws into 4 codes	Delayed state-level implementation
Introduction of national wage floor	Exclusion of small enterprises
Digital compliance systems	Erosion of trade union rights
Inclusion of gig/platform workers	Lack of social security fund structure

Conclusion

India's labour and social security legislative landscape is undergoing a monumental transformation with the codification of 29 central laws into four comprehensive Labour Codes. These reforms aim to address long-standing issues of multiplicity, ambiguity, and regulatory burden, while also broadening coverage to informal and gig economy workers. However, a critical review of secondary literature and sectoral impacts reveals that while the intent of rationalization and modernization is commendable, the implementation realities and legal nuances pose substantial challenges.

The new Labour Codes reflect a shift toward procedural efficiency and centralized compliance but raise concerns regarding the dilution of substantive worker rights, particularly in areas such as trade union representation, dispute resolution, retrenchment protection, and social security contributions for unorganized sectors. The inclusion of gig and platform workers under the Social Security Code is a progressive step, but ambiguity in contribution structures and enforcement mechanisms risks rendering these provisions ineffective. Moreover, the delayed notification of state-level rules and inadequate digital infrastructure in many regions further hinder effective execution.

Sector-wise analysis indicates uneven impact: the manufacturing sector benefits from enhanced flexibility; the construction sector continues to suffer from informality and exclusion; gig workers remain vulnerable despite legislative recognition; and the IT/ITES sector is insufficiently regulated in terms of emerging workplace realities. The reforms, though forward-looking in design, require robust institutional support, inclusive policy frameworks, and multi-level stakeholder engagement to realize their transformative potential.

Recommendations

1. **Strengthen State-Level Implementation:** Expedite notification of rules by state governments with adequate training, staffing, and interdepartmental coordination.
2. **Ensure Clarity for Gig and Platform Workers:** Define clear contribution formulas and establish a central social security fund with platform accountability.
3. **Revitalize Trade Union Rights:** Revisit thresholds for recognition and participation to promote inclusive collective bargaining.

4. **Enhance Labour Inspection Systems:** Blend digital compliance with physical audits for high-risk industries to prevent tokenism.
5. **Expand Awareness Campaigns:** Use multilingual, mobile-friendly platforms to educate workers—especially in the informal sector—on their rights and benefits.
6. **Incorporate Feedback Mechanisms:** Institute periodic reviews and social dialogues involving employers, workers, and legal experts to adapt laws to evolving industrial needs.

In conclusion, the Labour Codes present an opportunity for inclusive and equitable industrial growth, but their success depends on participatory governance, strong institutions, and a renewed commitment to labour justice.

References:

1. Ministry of Labour and Employment. *Report of the Expert Committee on Labour Laws*. New Delhi: Government of India, 2002.
2. Bhattacharjee, Debashish. “Reforming Labour Market Institutions in India: Toward Inclusive Growth.” *Indian Journal of Labour Economics* 52, no. 3 (2009): 499–518.
3. Chand, Ramesh, S. K. Srivastava, and Jaspal Singh. *Labour Reforms in India: Some Perspectives and the Way Forward*. NITI Aayog, Government of India, 2020.
4. ILO. *India Wage Report: Wage Policies for Decent Work and Inclusive Growth*. Geneva: International Labour Organization, 2018.
5. Deshpande, Satish. *Labour Market Discrimination in India: Theory and Evidence*. New Delhi: Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER), 2011.
6. Mehrotra, Santosh. “Informal Employment Trends in the Indian Economy: Persistent Informality, but Growing Positive Development.” *ILO Employment Working Paper No. 254*, 2019.
7. Roychowdhury, Supriya. “Labour Law Reforms in India: All in the Name of Simplification.” *Economic and Political Weekly* 55, no. 39 (2020): 14–17.
8. Government of India. *Code on Wages, 2019*. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice, 2019.
9. Government of India. *Industrial Relations Code, 2020*. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice, 2020.

Navigating Labour and Social Security Legislation in Indian Industries: A Critical Legal and Sectoral Review

10. Government of India. *Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020*. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice, 2020.
11. Government of India. *Code on Social Security, 2020*. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice, 2020.
12. Papola, T. S. "Role of Labour Regulation and Reforms in India." *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics* 56, no. 4 (2013): 537–548.
13. Mitra, Arup. "The Informal Sector in India: A Means of Exploitation or Empowerment?" *Journal of South Asian Development* 3, no. 1 (2008): 1–24.
14. D'Souza, Errol. *Labour Market Institutions in India: Their Impact on Growth and Employment*. New Delhi: ILO Subregional Office for South Asia, 2010.
15. Standing, Guy. "Labour Reforms, Precarity and the Emerging Precariat in India." *Global Labour Journal* 8, no. 2 (2017): 159–175.
16. Babu, Ramesh. "Social Security for the Unorganised Workers in India: Issues and Concerns." *Indian Journal of Social Development* 12, no. 1 (2012): 33–46.
17. Srivastava, Ravi. "Social Protection for Workers in India: Struggles and Dilemmas." *Indian Journal of Human Development* 9, no. 2 (2015): 125–145.
18. Kapoor, Radhicka. "Creating Jobs in India's Organized Manufacturing Sector." *IZA Policy Paper No. 85*, Institute for the Study of Labor, 2014.
19. Lahoti, Rahul, and Hema Swaminathan. "Economic Reforms and Labour Market Outcomes in India: A Critical Review." *Journal of Economic Policy and Research* 8, no. 1 (2013): 36–54.
20. Confederation of Indian Industry (CII). *Labour Law Reforms: Unlocking India's Economic Potential*. New Delhi: CII Publications, 2021.
21. Gupta, P. (2023). Emotional Intelligence & Personality Development of Employees in Indian Industries. *Shodh Sari-An International Multidisciplinary Journal*, 02(03), 261–273. <https://doi.org/10.59231/sari7604>
22. Rani, P. (2024a). A Multidimensional Exploration of the Interplay between Human Health and Environmental Factors. *Shodh Sari-An International Multidisciplinary Journal*, 03(03), 225–237. <https://doi.org/10.59231/sari7730>